

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 20 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 7 and 12 have been amended. In view of the above amendments and arguments for patentability presented hereinbelow, reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 – 5 and 7-20 stand rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over British Telecommunications (“Speech Mail,” British Telecommunications, 2000, Web Site, Available at <http://www.btinternet.com> and <http://www.btinternet.com/new/content/mobile/speechmail/register.html>) (“British Telecommunications”) in view of Klug U.S. Patent No. 5,790,785 (“Klug”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the combination of British Telecommunications and Klug fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

As explained in the prior response, in accordance with an aspect of the invention a user can activate the auxiliary service with the second service provider without the need for the user to perform undue and burdensome information entry during the activation process to obtain the auxiliary service through the second service provider. In this connection, the second service provider accesses the registration information provided to the first service provider, such that the user is not required to repeat entries of redundant and/or unmemorable personal/account information or login credentials which may have been previously provided by the user during registration and activation of the user’s existing electronic mail account with the first service provider (e.g., the user’s name, address, telephone number, mail server name, IP address, etc). In this regard, independent claim 1 has been amended to emphasize that the auxiliary services provided by the second service provider effects registration by “accessing registration information for the one or more existing messaging accounts *from the service provider of the one or more existing messaging accounts.*”

The Examiner asserts:

British Telecommunications fails to specifically recite accessing registration information for the one or more existing messaging accounts. It should be noted that it is extremely likely that British [T]elecommunications shared registration information with Vocalis during the activation process since the user only provides their name, account login information, and PIN number to Vocalis in order to enable SpeechMail. Any additional information needed is most likely provided by British Telecommunications. However, even if no information was

shared, it would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed in British Telecommunications to do so, as evidenced by Klug.

Office Action at pp. 4 - 5, ¶7 (emphasis added).

Applicants agree with the Examiner's statement in ¶4 of the Office Action that the Examiner did not admit that "it was extremely unlikely that British Telecommunications shared registration information with Vocalis." The "unlikely" statement which appeared in the block quotes of the previous response was a typo, and Applicants' contention that the Examiner admitted the same was erroneously stated as a result of that typo. However, Applicants respectfully do not agree with the Examiner's conclusion that it was "extremely likely" as a basis for the rejection. There is nothing in the cited literature evidencing that Vocalis obtained registration information from British Telecommunications that obviated the need for the user to provide such registration information to Vocalis to effectuate the SpeechMail service. In fact, the cited reference "register[1]," found at the following web link <http://www.btinternet.com/new/content/mobile/speechmail/register.html>, requires the user to input registration information, including passwords, as explicitly stated as follows:

This form takes you through the process of registering for a new BTinternet SpeechMail account, by gathering details about you and your new account. Please complete all fields, then click on the 'Continue' button.

If you have any trouble with the registration process, please call BTinternet during normal working hours.

Your First Name	<input type="text"/>
Your dial-up account name	<input type="text"/> @btinternet.com
Your POP password	<input type="password"/>
Choose a PIN for your SpeechMail account	<input type="password"/>

The cited registration form clearly states that "this form takes you through the process of registering for a new BTinternet SpeechMail account, *by gathering details about you and your new account...*" (emphasis added). Thus, this demonstrates that the user provides at least some of the same information to activate the SpeechMail account (e.g., name, dial-up account name, POP password). Moreover, it is unknown what additional information the user may or may not provide when "continue" is selected. In accordance with an aspect of the present invention, the

user merely selects an auxiliary service connected to the existing messaging account such that the auxiliary service receives “...a request for activation...” and then accesses “...registration information for the one or more existing messaging accounts....” Therefore, Applicants respectfully reiterate their position that British Telecommunications does not suggest a method of providing enhanced service activation for auxiliary services where *information relating to an existing account* is utilized for providing service activation to the *auxiliary* services such that “*the same activation information* provided by the one or more account holders to the account providers that are providing the one or more existing messaging accounts *does not have to be provided* by the one or more account holders *to the service providers that provide the auxiliary services*” by the user.

Applicants maintain that the Examiner’s statement “[h]owever, even if no information was shared, it would be an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by British Telecommunications as evidenced by Klug,” is a conclusion that states the advantages provided by the present invention without any support for the asserted combination of references.

The Examiner cites to Klug as follows:

Klug teaches a system for storing user account registration information at one location and sharing that information with other service providers upon request of the user, dramatically reducing the number of times that a user must enter registration information to access various services (at least Col 1, Line 60 to Col 2, Line 19). By saving the information at the central location, additional services can be activated without requiring redundant input of registration information. This would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by British Telecommunications since it would have allowed the user to activate the SpeechMail service without requiring redundant input of data.

Office Action at p. 5, ¶7.

Klug discloses a system for assisting web users to provide registration information that is previously provided to a central registration website to be subsequently provided to a “new website cooperating with the registration process of the present invention.” See Col. 2, lines 24 – 38. Specifically, users are directed to a “registrar web site 100” that enables subsequent registration at various third party web sites 116 that are affiliated with the registrar site 100 when the user submits a response to a third party site 116 requesting that registration information be obtained from the registrar site 100. See Col. 4, line 60 – Col. 5, line 7.

At the outset, Applicants submit that this has nothing to do with a method of providing enhanced service activation for *auxiliary services* by an account holder of an existing messaging account with a first provider, where the auxiliary services are provided by a second service provider in the context of the present invention. The fact that a plurality of websites may be linked, as in Klug, with a single registration site, is inapposite to the present invention. In accordance with an aspect of the claimed invention, a first service provider confers the option to a user to obtain an auxiliary service through an expedited registration procedure that utilizes information related to the first service so that the user does not have to enter redundant information to register with the second (auxiliary) service. In Klug, user identification, passwords and personal information such as, for example, city of residence and family size (see Col. 1, lines 45 – 47) are merely stored in a central registration site that may be accessed by unrelated websites that cooperate with the central site to retrieve the user's personal information. Thus, Klug contains no teaching or suggestion of enabling auxiliary service registration to be performed by a service provider accessing the registration information of an existing messaging account.

It is well settled that there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine references and that it is impermissible to pick and choose features from the prior art using Applicants' claims as a roadmap. Here, there is nothing that supports the conclusion that British Telecommunications shared information with its SpeechMail provider Vocalis to obviate the need for the user to repeat redundant information as the register (1) Web link (above) calls for the user to enter redundant information (e.g., e-mail address). Moreover, the Examiner's contention that it would be "advantageous" to do is not evidence of suggestion or motivation to combine British Telecommunications with Klug. Klug is related to a system that provides a central registration website to enable other websites that cooperate with the central site to obtain stored registration information from the central site. There is nothing in Klug that would suggest modifying British Telecommunications such that the provider of the auxiliary service SpeechMail obtains registration information from the British Telecommunications service. Thus, Applicants submit that the combination of British Telecommunications and Klug is improper. Moreover, even if, assuming *arguendo*, this combination of references would be proper, such combination might arguably provide a system wherein a subscriber to the messaging accounts with the first provider and the auxiliary services with a second provider

registers with a third party registration service (as taught by Klug), not an expedient where a first provider of a messaging account(s) enables a second provider *of an auxiliary service* to obtain registration information *from the first provider*.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is patentable over the combination of British Telecommunications and Klug, and that those claims that ultimately depend from claim 1 are patentable for at least the same reasons. It is further submitted that independent claims 7 and 12, which contain similar features (i.e., “activating the enhanced service *related* to the electronic mail account *from a service provider of the electronic mail account*” (claim 7) and “accessing the stored registration information for the first service *from the first service provider* and; activating the one or more other *enhanced services* using the stored registration information from the first service” (claim 12)) are patentable for the same reasons, and that those claims that ultimately depend from claims 7 and 12 are patentable for at least the same reasons.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 to AT&T Corp. Account No. 01-2745. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (908) 707-1573 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Kocheisen, et al.
By:

Date: 11/28/05



Gary H. Monka
Registration No. 35,290
Attorney for Applicant

Canavan & Monka, LLC.
250 State Route 28, Suite 207
Bridgewater, New Jersey 08807
(908) 707-1573